

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.

I agree with this pre-written statement, and would also like to add that an action like this (a biased broadcast by a major corporation just before a major election) undermines the entire idea of a democratic system of government. It basically produces the notion that the individual does not make any difference, and that large corporations like Sinclair are the real powers (not the people, as it should be in a democratic system) that choose the administration(s) that run the U.S.A. from the national level all the way down to local politics. Thank you.     Andrew Kalstrom